BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08653 641 2

No. 70-84.120

GIVEN BY

Moorfield Storey

NEGRO SUFFRAGE IS NOT A FAILURE

MOORFIELD STOREY

NEGRO SUFFRAGE IS NOT A FAILURE

AN ADDRESS BEFORE THE NEW ENGLAND SUFFRAGE CONFERENCE MARCH 30, 1903

BY

MOORFIELD STOREY

7584.123

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON
GEO. H. ELLIS CO., PRINTERS, 272 CONGRESS STREET
1903

lack

Moorfield Storey,
July 22, 1903.

PUBLIC LIBRARY
OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

Thirty-three years ago the Fifteenth Amendment became a part of the Constitution, and the negro, already a citizen and assured of his right to life, liberty, and property by the Fourteenth Amendment, was secured against the denial of his right to vote by reason of his race. The adoption of this amendment marked the end of a long struggle for justice. Nearly a century before had "our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal"; but they lacked the courage to build as well as they knew, when they framed their government. "In the necessities of the hour," to quote the words of Emerson, "they overlooked the moral law, and winked at a practical exception to the bill of rights they had drawn up. They winked at the exception, believing it insignificant. But the moral law, the nature of things, did not wink at it, but kept its eyes wide open. It turned out that this one violation was a subtle poison, which in eighty years corrupted the whole body politic, and brought the alternative of extirpation of the poison or ruin to the republic." While insisting that all men were created with an equal right to life and liberty, they undertook to hold nearly half a million men as slaves, and apparently believed that this attempt was safe. Yet at the very outset of the experiment began the irrepressible conflict, which steadily increasing in violence and bitterness culminated in the civil war with all its frightful suffering and loss. This was the penalty which the nation paid for persisting in a policy of injustice: it was the inevitable consequence of that policy, and not till the flower of our youth on both sides was in large measure dead or disabled by wounds,— not till we had suffered as many plagues as were visited upon Pharaoh, did we resolve to do right.

While the wounds of the war were still bleeding and its lesson was fresh in our minds, we decided to do justice and secured the equal rights of all men by appropriate additions to our fundamental law. It was the supreme moment in our history. The nation then reached its highest moral level, and judged by its national action seemed to share the faith which Charles Sumner thus expressed:

"Show me a creature with lifted countenance looking to heaven, made in the image of God, and I show you a Man who of whatever country or race, whether bronzed by equatorial sun or blanched by polar cold, is with you a child of the Heavenly Father, and equal with you in all the rights of human nature."

For a generation the wisdom of this course has not been questioned at least in the North. The Republican party has pointed with pride to its achievements in behalf of human freedom and equal rights, and upon these has rested its claim to the support of the moral forces in the nation. Lincoln, Sumner, Andrew, Seward, Chase, the authors of its policy, have been its Saints and Prophets and have been held in the highest honor.

Now, however, we are told that the policy of justice is wrong, that it was a mistake to treat negroes as citizens, and that it is expedient now to deprive them of the right to vote which they have in theory at least enjoyed so long. Secretary Root, who is a spokesman of the Republican Administration, tells us that negro suffrage "has proved a failure." Dr. Lyman Abbott, its devoted supporter, says, "Suffrage must wait for education. Education is primary: political rights are secondary. We have tried the experiment of giving to the Negro suffrage first and education afterward, and bitterly has the country suffered from our blunder." The Boston *Herald* says, "It is now we think generally recognized that a mistake was made at the close of our civil war in according suffrage generally to the emancipated negro."

These are quoted as different expressions of essentially the same view coming from different quarters, and it is a view

which doubtless is for the moment very common. Its expression encourages many men in the South to resolve, as the Charleston *Evening Post* openly says: "We will subordinate the negro and not worry about the fundamental forms of government." In a word, these thinkers say that the policy of justice has failed, while others like the New York *Sun* even suggest that we must repeal the Fifteenth Amendment and try oppression again.

Yet it may well be doubted whether those who express these views have not spoken upon a hasty general impression rather than a careful study of the conditions which confronted this country at the end of the civil war, and whether they have considered either the purpose or the results of the policy then adopted. Justice in human government never fails, and any one who concludes in a given case that it has failed, must revise his premises.

Was it a mistake to give the negroes the right to vote? Whether it was or not, is it right now to deprive them of it? Has negro suffrage proved a failure? These are questions not merely for the Southern States, but for us all, since, to borrow Emerson's statement of a fundamental political maxim, "Only that State can live in which injury to the least member is recognized as damage to the whole."

What were the conditions which confronted us when the civil war ended? The entire social, political, and industrial system of the Southern States was shattered. Of their men had been slain more than were killed of Englishmen in all the wars of England from the Norman conquest till 1865. The property of the white population was gone, their slaves were free, some of their cities and many of their homes were in ruins, their fields were desolate, they had no capital, their labor was disorganized. They felt that their cause was just, but that they had been defeated by overwhelming force. They believed that slavery was right, but slavery had been abolished. Bereaved, impoverished, and defeated, the white people of the South could not help feeling the bitterness of their lot nor could they have any sentiment of cordial loyalty

towards their conquerors. Taught from their cradle that the negroes were an inferior race, they could not help looking down upon them,— they could not help thinking them unfit for freedom,— they could not help believing and wishing that the negroes should be kept in a position of subordination. We may be sure that the sentiment which resented so bitterly the entertainment of Booker Washington by the President was quite as strong a generation ago, when the slaves were first freed and every master was smarting with the sense of recent loss.

On the other hand the negroes had inherited only the curse of slavery, they had with rare exceptions no education, they had no land, no property, no homes, no money, no habits of thrift, no experience in caring for themselves. But yesterday they had been chattels with no rights and no hopes. To-day they were free, but in every other respect they were unchanged.

There were besides these classes some white Union men whom their neighbors hated with intense bitterness as traitors to the Southern cause, and whose lives and property were safe only through the protection afforded by the Federal troops. No one who will study the records of this period can doubt that this statement of the conditions which existed in the South when the war ended is in no respect exaggerated.

What then was necessarily the object to be accomplished by legislation? In the answer to this question lies the difference between the opposing views upon this subject. The object was not primarily to secure well-tilled fields, well-ordered towns, an industrious laboring class, nor even a legislature, a bench and an executive taken from the ablest men in the State. All these results had been secured by slavery. Had these been the object of our policy, slavery need never have been destroyed. It was because these advantages, the material prosperity of a few, had been gained by the degradation of a whole race,— because millions of human beings had been denied the rights and hopes of humanity, that slavery was abolished, and unless we carried the work through we

had far better never have begun it. The same reason that led us to abolish slavery forbade us to establish any legal inequality between man and man. Anything less than equality of rights was sure to be the seed of future trouble. It would mean slavery modified, but not abolished. The conditions which confronted Congress were the legitimate fruits of slavery, and it was the clear duty of the nation to make an end of the evil, root and branch, to lay the foundation of a free society deep and sound. The object of our policy was to make men,— to turn some millions of "chattels" into human beings, first to secure their freedom against all dangers, and then to help them from the wretched slough of despond in which slavery had left them up to the firm ground of self-respecting manhood.

No more difficult problem was ever presented to a lawgiver. Had the attitude of the white population been different, the way would have been smoother. During the four years of war which had just ended while the men of the South were at the front, the women and children were left in the charge of the negroes, and the trust was faithfully kept. The negroes tilled the fields and raised the crops which fed the Southern armies, and in effect carried upon their backs the soldiers who were fighting to keep them in slavery. History affords no example of loyalty like this, and had the masters been willing to accept the situation and to help their former slaves to become men, they could have exercised a legitimate control over their actions, and the transition from slavery to freedom might have been comparatively easy.

It was perhaps too much to expect of human nature that men who had known the negroes as their slaves should voluntarily help them to become their equals, that in the bitterness of defeat and destitution they should be entirely reasonable. It is enough to recognize the historical facts without attempting to distribute the blame for the deplorable conditions which existed. What the student and the critic, however, must bear constantly in mind is that the feel-

ings of the Southern white population, their traditions and their prejudices, their poverty and their bitterness on the one side, and the ignorance, destitution, and degradation of the negroes on the other were stubborn facts, which no legislation could change. These conditions inevitably meant conflict between old prejudices and new conditions, suffering for all parties, misunderstandings and quarrels, in a word all the disagreeable concomitants of a struggle uphill from wretchedness to better things. Law could not create wealth, assuage grief, destroy prejudices, or give knowledge. There was no royal road to a reconstructed society. All that law could do was to remove obstacles and give opportunities; the rest must be done by the people themselves. Old men must die, new men must be born, children must be educated and grow up under new conditions and with new ideals, wealth must be created by toil. A long series of years was needed to eradicate evils, which had been fostered by centuries of slavery. Whatever course was adopted, trouble was inevitable, and it was equally certain that men would thoughtlessly blame the laws for evils which no law could cure, but which were in themselves.

In much that is said upon this question it seems to be assumed that suffrage was granted to the negroes at the outset of reconstruction. The fact is exactly the reverse. The experiment of reconstruction without negro suffrage was tried first and failed completely.

Passing over as not significant in this connection the early attempts of Mr. Lincoln to establish governments in Arkansas and Louisiana, let us pass at once to the reconstruction attempted by President Johnson. On May 29, 1865, he issued a proclamation of amnesty and on the same day another providing for reconstruction in North Carolina through a convention to be chosen only by persons qualified to vote before secession, thus excluding all colored men from the electorate. He followed this precedent in all the other states, appointing in each a provisional governor and providing for a constitutional convention, which framed a state government

under which elections were held for state officers and members of Congress. Colored men were uniformly excluded from taking any part in these proceedings, while all white men were allowed to vote and hold office except a few belonging to certain specified classes who could on special application be pardoned by the President. The country had therefore an opportunity to see exactly what reconstruction without negro suffrage would mean, and it is to be observed that the leaders of the Republican party were by no means agreed in opposing this policy, while very few in fact were ready to give the negro the ballot. The correspondence of Mr. Sumner shows how little support he had from his colleagues in the Senate, and even Thaddeus Stevens could not get from the Republican Convention of Pennsylvania any expression in favor of equal suffrage. It was the course of the Southern States themselves that united Congress in its support.

If after the lapse of a generation the Charleston *Evening Post* can say, "We will subordinate the negro, and not worry about the fundamental forms of government," we may be sure that this determination was present with far greater intensity in the first years after emancipation. If Mr. Cox, of Ohio, could say in the House of Representatives, "No government farming system, no charitable black scheme, can wash out the color of the negro, change his inferior nature, or save him from his inevitable fate. The irrepressible conflict is not between freedom and slavery, but between black and white; and, as De Tocqueville prophesied, the black will perish," we cannot doubt that a like feeling prevailed in the South.

As a matter of fact the Ku-Klux Klan made its appearance in 1866, and soon spread all over the South. Its victims were Union men and negroes, its methods, plans, and membership were secret, and it intimidated, whipped and murdered men with impunity. Colored schools were closed, schoolmasters and clergymen shot and hanged, and the testimony makes it apparent that it was a movement to intimidate the negroes and hold them in subjection.

The legislatures established under the Johnson proclamation passed a great variety of laws, well devised to keep the negroes in practical slavery. Some made it a criminal offence for a negro to leave his employer before the expiration of a term of service fixed by a written contract. It was made a crime to entice a laborer away, or, after he had left his employer, to harbor or feed him. Any person was authorized by force and without process to carry a deserting laborer back to his employer, and was to be compensated for so doing. Freedmen were made vagrants for acting as ministers without a license or for unlawfully assembling by day or night. Whites who usually associated with colored people, persons who entered a plantation without the owner's consent, colored people who intruded themselves into any religious or other public assembly of white persons, were made criminals, and in this way negroes were deprived of the right to meet and were cut off from information as to their rights, while white teachers, whom the white people would not receive, were punished for living with their colored pupils. These laws were enforced by stripes, and the system also grew up of selling colored men under decree of court into service for limited times. In some places colored men were seized and sold in this way without any pretence of law, and it was apparent that unless such practices were checked virtual slavery would soon be established. Such evils grow rapidly by neglect. Early in 1866 a statute was passed to prevent a practice, thus described in a letter read by Mr. Sumner to the Senate on January 9, 1866.

"Another big trade is going on,— that of running negroes to Cuba and Brazil. They are running through the country dressed in Yankee clothes hiring men, giving them any price they ask, to make turpentine on the bay, sometimes on the rivers, sometimes to make sugar. They get them on the cars. Of course the negro don't know where he is going. They get him to the bay and tell him to go on the steamer to go around the coast, and away goes poor Cuffee to slavery again. They are just cleaning out this section of the country of the likeliest men and women in it."

The testimony from private sources was voluminous, and much is given in the speech made by Mr. Sumner on December 20, 1865. One writer says, "The Southerners are too smart not to see that slavery is dead, but many of them hope as long as the black race exists here to be able to hold it in a condition of practical serfdom."

The negroes were ignorant of their rights and easily influenced, and it soon became apparent that they would ignorantly make the most improvident contracts, and become embarrassed by debts to the whites, which afforded a ready means of keeping them in compulsory servitude. Debt alone often enslaves free men, but it could easily be made more effective by such methods as are disclosed in the following advertisement: —

PUBLIC SALE. The undersigned will sell at the court house door in the city of Annapolis at twelve o'clock M. on Saturday 8th December 1866 a negro man named Richard Harris for six months convicted at the October term 1866 of the Anne Arundel County Circuit Court for larceny and sentenced by the Court to be sold as a slave.

WM. BRYAN,
Sheriff Anne Arundel County.

A Wilmington newspaper reported that an official examination made by General Ames and others established that

"The negroes have been cruelly treated not only by the civilians, but also by the civil authorities.

"Two negroes were tied up and publicly whipped by the sheriff at the sentence of a magistrate."

"Other negroes were tied up to trees and whipped and left tied to the trees until a storm came up and prostrated the tree and the poor negroes fell with them.

"Citizens exercised the authority of masters over the negroes and punished them at their will with such severity as to them seemed fit."

A meeting of white citizens in South Carolina resolved that the freedman should be compelled to contract with his former owner, pledged its members not to contract with any

freedman who did not bring a discharge from his former owner, and under no circumstances to rent land to a freedman. From every State came the tales of oppression, cruelty, and outrage, and they were confirmed by the report of Carl Schurz sent as a special commissioner by the President to report on conditions in the Southern States. His conclusion was definite that it "would hardly be possible to secure the freedman against oppressive legislation and private persecution unless he be endowed with a certain measure of political power," and that "although the freedman is no longer considered the property of an individual master, he is considered the slave of society, and all independent state legislation will share the tendency to make him such."

To save the Union we had given the negro his freedom, and had enlisted him in our army. To preserve his freedom and to make sure that the work just done at such frightful cost was done forever, it was necessary to give him the ballot.

Mr. Schurz's report was made as early as December, 1865, and the facts which have been cited were known to Congress about the same time. Yet there was no precipitate action. A committee was appointed after debate to inquire into the conditions existing in the Southern States, and not till February 6, 1867, did Thaddeus Stevens report his bill to set aside the Johnson governments, put the Southern States under military control, and provide for a new reconstruction. This bill which passed in March, 1867, over the President's veto contained the provision for negro suffrage under which the Southern States were again reconstructed, and this review shows that reconstruction with only white suffrage had then been tried for nearly two years. The measure finally adopted was of proved necessity. Thus and thus only could the lives and the property of colored men and white Union men be protected. They needed every weapon that we could place in their hands, and this weapon was among them.

But the case does not end here. We had been contending with a system founded on the inequality of men. That was the root of slavery. If slavery was abolished, its root must

be extirpated. It was not enough to say, "The negroes shall have some rights, but may not have others." It was not enough to say that they were somewhere between beasts and men. Any such concession to the claims of slavery only meant another contest sooner or later to complete their emancipation. Unless they had the right to vote, they could not protect their other rights.

Nor was it safe to say, "You can vote when you are educated." They needed the vote in order to get education. They were substantially all ignorant in 1865, and if the power had been in the hands of the whites or the educated people, which meant the same thing, could they have been trusted to provide the negroes with the means of education in order that they might thus acquire the suffrage and obtain control of the State? The whites were then obstructing colored education, whipping and in some cases shooting the teachers. To have put the white people in control, while making colored suffrage conditional upon education, would have been to offer the whites continued power on condition of keeping the negroes ignorant. Would that have been statesmanship, or would that have smoothed the negroes' path to freedom? The wise course was to cut deep once for all, to remove all inequality, to give the negro all the legal rights of every other man, and then to let him with such help as we could give gradually work his way up.

Such a policy is moreover to be defended upon the ground till lately maintained by us all, that the way to make a man is to treat him as a man; that responsibility is in itself the best educator. It is not easy to state the argument and to illustrate at the same time the change of view into which many men have been driven by our Asiatic policy, better than by the following quotation from Dr. Lyman Abbott, who in his book on "Christianity and Social Problems" published in 1896, quotes Carlyle's argument,— "If thou do know better than I what is good and right, I conjure you in the name of God force me to do it: were it never by such brass collars, whips and handcuffs, leave me not to walk over precipices,"

and then answers it well and wisely thus: "No, this is not liberty: it is servitude. . . . Freedom. . . . assumes not that every man can safely govern himself, but first that it is safer to leave every man to govern himself than to put any man under the government of any other class; and, secondly, that there is such potentiality of self-governing power in every man, such capacity to learn by his blunders, that he will acquire a wisdom and self-restraint through the very perils of self-government, which he will never acquire under the protecting government of others wiser and better than himself."

It was that he might protect his new freedom and his newly acquired rights and that he might also learn to be a man through exercising the powers and feeling the responsibilities of a man that we gave the ballot to the negro.

And now we are told that negro suffrage has proved a failure, by a leader of the Republican party. What does he mean? Colored men vote in every Northern State. Has any one claimed that they have proved in practice less discriminating or less competent to vote than their white neighbors? Surely no Republican leader can claim this without stultifying himself, since they have as constantly supported that party as the immovable hosts of Pennsylvania. Colored suffrage is not a failure in the North, where it is exercised freely, and if this is so the color is no disqualification. Is it a failure in Maryland or Kentucky or Missouri? No complaints come from those states. It is then in the Southern States if anywhere that it has proved a failure.

How stands the account there? Go back to Appomattox and recall in memory the hosts of negroes who then filled the Southern States, ignorant, poor, degraded, with no land, no home, no capital, and all the weaknesses and vices which centuries of slavery had entailed upon them. Visit the same region now, after the lapse of only a single generation, think of Booker Washington and Hampton with its students, count the farms which are owned by negroes, number their bank deposits, see how many positions of use and influence they occupy, and then say that the policy of justice has failed

and that it was wrong to recognize the negro as a man. Where in history has a race from such a depth risen so rapidly? Did the early English, the Irish, the Germans or any other race during the dark ages advance as quickly? Few men who know the conditions of 1865 could have dared to hope that the negro race would have been where it is in 1903. Justice has not failed. It has won a conspicuous success. This record is the most convincing proof that the way to elevate and civilize a man is to recognize him as a man and to trust him.

But there was bad government in the South, reckless extravagance, an orgy of corruption after negro suffrage was granted. It is true that for a few years, beginning in 1868 and ending at various times up to 1876, corrupt men chosen by negro votes controlled the Southern States. Whose fault was that? New voters were misled and voted for dishonest men. They were misled in most cases by dishonest Southern white men, and this was made possible because the honest Southern white men in disgust refused to lead them right, or to exercise their just influence. But if this were not so, can we insist that the color is the cause? While Pennsylvania bows to Quay: while Montana elects Clark; while Addicks owns Delaware; while the trials at St. Louis reveal the nature of her rulers, and Minneapolis is punishing Ames, are we sure that white suffrage is a success? Is it color, or our common humanity which is at fault? Some of the staid New England voters of Rhode Island and Connecticut, to go no further, are purchasable. Would it not indeed be surprising if in the first eight years after their enfranchisement, deserted by their proper leaders and dominated by bad men, the freedmen had shown a character and a hatred of corruption which their white brothers do not show after centuries of civilization and self-government? Had they done so, they would have shown themselves not only not inferior, but far superior to their white neighbors. Can we condemn a race to permanent inferiority because of this experience, while we close our eyes to the corruption

which through the campaign fund buys elections? Some men buy offices, some buy clauses in the tariff, some buy seats in the Senate, some franchises in state or city, and among them are some of our political and financial leaders. Can they be sure that the negroes who nearly a generation ago sold their votes were conspicuously inferior to themselves on that account?

Indeed in the Southern States since 1876 negro suffrage *has not been tried* and therefore has not failed. The Ku-Klux Klan and the tissue paper ballot are not negro suffrage. Force and fraud have failed, injustice has failed, as they always will fail in a universe governed by moral laws, but their failure is not the failure of equal suffrage. The solid South is the answer to any claim that negro suffrage is responsible for any failure in the government of the South since 1876.

We of the North perhaps wisely have left the negro to assert his rights, believing that "who would be free himself must strike the blow." He has shrunk from a contest of strength with the whites and perhaps also wisely, for the gradual gain which the race is making in education, experience, manhood, property and standing is making it impossible long to deny their right to vote. Under the educational and property qualifications in the present Southern Constitutions they will gradually be admitted to suffrage, and when the whites divide, as they inevitably must, one party or the other will turn for allies to these potential voters and will open wide the door for their admission to full political rights. Meanwhile suffrage has done its work. It has prevented the re-enslavement of the negroes, and from now on the struggle should be easier.

There is one thing that can delay their progress, and that is the attempt to hold them inferior to their neighbors, too readily acquiesced in by Northern men. That Southern men should have this prejudice with their inheritance is natural. That Northern men should educate themselves to share it is monstrous. Men say that the negro must be disfranchised to save civilization, but it may be doubted if a man is civilized

himself who preaches this doctrine. To such may be commended Lord Russell's definition of civilization: —

"What indeed is true civilization? By its fruit you shall know it. It is not dominion, wealth, material luxury; nay, not even a great literature and education widespread — good though these things be. Civilization is not a veneer. It must penetrate to the very heart and core of societies of men. Its true signs are thought for the poor and suffering, chivalrous regard and respect for women, the frank recognition of human brotherhood, irrespective of race or color or nation or religion, the narrowing of the domain of mere force as a governing factor in the world, the love of ordered freedom, abhorrence of what is mean and cruel and vile, ceaseless devotion to the claims of justice."

This true civilization is never advanced by looking down upon our fellows because they are poorer or more ignorant than ourselves.

There is a genuine danger, however, that in the reaction which is now taking place against the fundamental principles of liberty a serious injury may be done to the principles and the ideals of this generation. An evil tendency unchecked gathers force until its consequences work in time a cure at the expense of the community, as was the case with slavery. This country belongs to our colored fellow-citizens as much as it does to us. It is their birthplace, their home, and it will be the home of their children. They have every right which we can claim, and their descendants and ours will dwell here side by side. Their lives will not be made happier or more harmonious by our dwelling on the peculiar qualities which make the negroes in our judgment inferior to ourselves, nor will our country prosper through any effort to deprive them of any rights or to keep them from rising. Civilization and the highest political wisdom alike require that we should recognize the brotherhood of these as well as of all our fellow-citizens. We should do our best to elevate them, and at least be silent about any defects which we cannot cure, all the more because it is we who held them as slaves and are responsible for their

weakness and ignorance. We cannot degrade them and not degrade ourselves; their gain is our gain; injustice to them is injustice to us. In the words of Whittier:

> "Laws of changeless justice bind oppressor with oppressed,
> And close as sin and suffering joined we march to fate abreast."

For this reason it is the duty of every patriotic American to cease discussing the inferiority of the negro, or attaching to it any political or social consequences. It is our duty to resist any attempt anywhere to deprive them of that equality of rights, which as Mr. Sumner said is "the first of rights." With time and sympathy the differences between men largely disappear. Of undesirable social consequences, so often dwelt on, there is no danger. The two races dwell together in every Northern State and no complaint on this ground has been made. It has no more real terrors than any other scarecrow.

Let it once be agreed that the negro is inferior and that on this account he may be deprived of political rights, and it will not be long before other men are discovered who are also unfit to hold them. Ignorance is the real disqualification, and that is not peculiar to any color. There are many now who consider our foreign born citizens a great menace to our government, and their rights may go next. There are many who think that only men who pay a property tax should have a vote, and they would exclude the poor. The moment the doctrine of equal rights is abandoned, who shall draw the line?

Dazzled by a new ambition we have abandoned our principles, and are seeking to deprive a foreign nation of its liberty. We justify this by assuming that they are our inferiors. How quickly do we learn the truth of Lincoln's words: "They who deny freedom to others deserve it not themselves and under a just God will not long retain it." Just as Northern men in the war with slavery found free speech, free meeting, and personal liberty endangered at home, so now the attempt to conquer a brown race generates a feeling which

endangers the liberties of our own colored citizens. The connection is clear. It is openly avowed in the Southern press. Thus the Charleston *Evening Post* says: —

"It is quite evident that the discrimination against the dark races in the Philippines which is enforced by the Government under the direction of the Republican policy . . . must make the sponsors tolerant of, if not actually sympathetic with the discrimination which is practised in the Southern States and which is essential in this section to the maintenance of a high civilization. . . . We should not only go with, but drive the Republicans along the road of race discrimination in the Philippines, and before they could turn about they would find themselves shut within the confines of the South's traditional and essential race policy."

Our crime in the Philippines endangers the fruit of our long contest with slavery, and every friend of freedom must stand alike for the equal rights of the negroes in this country and the independence of the Filipinos in Asia. In both cases liberty is in danger and the peril comes from the great Republic whose honor should be dearer to her children than all the wealth of the Indies.

We may be sure, however, that the cause of right is not beaten. The time will come and at no distant date when this people will again believe with Lincoln, will again be proud of the great Declaration, when the follies and offences of to-day will be remembered with the bitterest regret and when the false prophets of injustice and oppression will be forgotten. Not many years ago a mob of respectable Bostonians dragged Garrison through the streets of Boston with a rope about his neck. No statue or picture of any man in that mob adorns any public place in that city, but in the centre of its proudest quarter stands the statue of Garrison and on its base is inscribed his lofty motto:

"My country is the world: my countrymen are all mankind."

His example and his triumph forbid us to falter.

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.